



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,915	08/31/2001	Andreas Westendorf	10191/2007	3903

7590  
KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004

12/04/2008

EXAMINER
----------

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2437

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/04/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/944,915	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WESTENDORF ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL PYZOSHA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-46 and 49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-46 and 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 22-46 and 49 are pending.
2. Response filed 10/27/2008 has been received and considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 22-24, 26-28, 31-34, 36, and 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peinado et al. (US 7051005) in view of Serkowski (US 6513121).

As per claims 22, 23, 41-45, and 47 Peinado et al. discloses transmitting first data to a first processor from one of a data medium drive and a third processor (see column 2 lines 41-56); transmitting second data to a second processor, the second data being based on the first data; checking the second data in the second processor to determine if the first data may be processed in the first processor (see column 3 lines 10-43); transmitting a positive check result to the first processor (see column 3 lines 31-43); and responsive to receiving the positive check result, processing the first data at the first processor (see column 3 lines 44-54).

Peinado et al. discloses sending a positive check result as described above, but fails to explicitly disclose sending a check result additionally when it is negative.

However, Serkowski teaches sending a check result when it is negative (see column 2 lines 3-30).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to send both positive and negative check results in the Peinado et al. system.

Motivation as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art to do so would have been to notify the requestor that the request has been denied.

As per claim 24, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses the limitations substantially similar to those of claim 22 and further discloses, wherein the step of transmitting the first data include transmitting the first data to the first processor from a data medium drive, and wherein the method further comprises: checking in the second processor an identity of a data carrier in the data medium drive (see Peinado et al. column 3 lines 31-43).

As per claim 26, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses checking an error-free transmission in at least one of the first processor and the second processor (see Peinado et al. column 2 line 66 through column 3 line 5).

As per claims 27 and 28, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses the data is transmitted in encoded form (see Peinado et al. column 2 line 66 through column 3 line 5).

As per claims 31, 33-34 and 36, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses accessing a database and allowing and storing data (see Peinado et al. column 3 lines 31-43).

As per claim 32, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses, initiating by the second processor a payment process as a function of the second data (see Peinado et al. column 20 lines 51-60).

As per claims 39 and 40, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses determining a first check code is determined from the first data; and forming the second data at least in part from the first check code (see Peinado et al. column 2 line 66 through column 3 line 43).

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Okada (US 6704872).

As per claim 25, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system discloses transmitting the first data to the first processor from a third processor (see column 2 lines 45-60 and figure 1), but fails to disclose including an identity of the processor with the authentication information.

However, Okada teaches including such information (see Abstract).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to including the identity of the processor with the information of the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system.

Motivation to do so would have been to restrict the use of a specific software program to a single processor (see Okada abstract).

6. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system.

As per claims 29 and 30, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system fails to disclose the use of wireless connections.

However, Official Notice is taken that at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use wireless connections.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for mobility.

7. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Gurr (US 4264960).

As per claim 35, Peinado et al. fails to disclose starting a check of the first data in the first processor; and restarting the check in the first processor if the check has not been run through completely.

However, Gurr et al teaches such a check (see column 16 line 52 through column 17 line 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the checking system of Gurr in the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system.

Motivation to do so would have been to check a message for errors (see Gurr column 16 line 52 through column 17 line 3).

8. Claims 37 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Coley et al. (US 5790664).

As per claim 37, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system fails to disclose deleting data if there is no license.

However, Coley et al. teaches such a practice (see column 14 lines 57-67).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to delete the content of the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system if there is no license.

Motivation to do so would have been to protect the data from unauthorized use (see Coley et al. column 14 lines 57-67).

As per claim 46, the modified Peinado et al., Serkowski and Coley et al. system discloses the checking is executed at specifiable time intervals (see column 8 lines 54-69 and column 9 lines 1-22 and 42-51).

9. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Flick (US 6140939).

As per claim 38, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system fails to disclose delivering a warning if the first data is not released.

However, Flick teaches such a warning (see column 3 lines 7-23).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the warning of Flick in the system of the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for updating of samples (see column 3 lines 7-23).

10. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Shamoon et al. (US 7233948).

As per claim 49, the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system fails to explicitly disclose deleting the first data in response to a negative check result.

However, Shamoon et al. teaches deleting when a result is negative (see column 9 lines 34-43).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to delete the content of the modified Peinado et al. and Serkowski system when the check result is negative.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent unauthorized alterations (see Shamoon et. al column 9 lines 34-43).

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Serkowski with Peinado; a combination with Serkowski would change the principle of operation of Peinado; and the remaining references fail to cure these deficiencies.

As per Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine Serkowski with Peinado the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the



references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that sending a negative result allows the system and user to be aware of the failure and use that information. Therefore, there is motivation to combine Serkowski with Peinado.

As per Applicant's argument that a combination with Serkowski would change the principle of operation of Peinado, such a combination would merely add functionality to Peinado rather than change its principle of operation. The combination would allow Peinado to notify the unauthorized, of "bad" users, that they have not been authorized and therefore will not be able to render the content. This gives the inherent benefit of allowing a user to know that they are unauthorized. Therefore, a combination with Serkowski would not change the principle of operation of Peinado.

Applicant's argument that the remaining references fail to cure the deficiencies of Peinado and Serkowski is moot in view of the above response.

Based on Applicant's submission of translated priority document, Ishiguro et al. has been replaced with Shmoon et al. and a new final has been issued based on the amendment filed 05/09/2008.

### ***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2437

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437